7

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

DEBATES

OF THE

AMERICAN CONGRESS,

ON

THE ADDRESSES

PRESENTED TO

GENERAL WASHINGTON,

ON HIS RESIGNATION:

WITH

REMARKS

ON THE

Timidity of the Language held towards France;
The Seizures of American Veſſels by Great Britain and France;

AND,

ON THE RELATIVE SITUATIONS OF THOSE COUNTRIES WITH AMERICA.

By Peter Porcupine,

Author of the *Bone to gnaw for Democrats,* — *Letter to Tom Paine, &c. &c.*

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,

GENERAL WASHINGTON'S

ADDRESS TO CONGRESS;

AND

THE ANSWERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Philadelphia printed:
LONDON REPRINTED,
FOR DAVID OGILVY AND SON, NO. 315, HOLBORN.

1797.

Price One Shilling.

BRITISH MUSEUM

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

DEBATES

OF THE

AMERICAN CONGRESS.

GENERAL WASHINGTON'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS.

December 7th, 1796.

Fellow Citizens of the Senate, and of the Houſe of Repreſentatives,

IN recurring to the internal ſituation of our country ſince I had laſt the pleaſure to addreſs you, I find ample reaſon for a renewed expreſſion of that gratitude to the Ruler of the Univerſe, which a continued ſeries of proſperity has ſo often and ſo juſtly called forth.

The acts of the laſt ſeſſion, which required ſpecial arrangements, have been, as far as circumſtances would admit, carried into operation.

Meaſures calculated to enſure a continuance of the friendſhip of the Indians, and to preſerve peace along the extent of our interior frontier, have been digeſted and adopted. In the framing of theſe, care has been taken to guard, on the one hand, our advanced ſettlements from the predatory incurſions of thoſe unruly individuals, who cannot be reſtrained by their tribes; and, on the other hand, to protect the rights ſecured to the Indians by treaty; to draw them nearer to the civilized ſtate, and inſpire them with correct conceptions of the power, as well as juſtice of the government.

The meeting of the deputies from the Creek nation at Coleraine, in the State of Georgia, which had for a principal object the purchaſe of a parcel of their land by that State, broke up without its being accompliſhed; the nation having, previous to their departure, inſtructed them againſt making any ſale; the occaſion however has been improved, to confirm by a new treaty with the Creeks, their pre-

exiſting engagements with the United States; and to obtain their conſent to the eſtabliſhment of trading houſes, and military poſts within their boundary; by means of which their friendſhip and the general peace may be more effectually ſecured.

The period during the late ſeſſion, at which the appropriation was paſſed, for carrying into effect the Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation, between the United States and his Britannic Majeſty, neceſſarily procraſtinated the reception of the poſts ſtipulated to be delivered, beyond the date aſſigned for that event.

As ſoon however as the Governor General of Canada could be addreſſed with propriety on the ſubject, arrangements were cordially and promptly concluded for their evacuation, and the United States took poſſeſſion of the principal of them, comprehending Oſwego, Niagara, Detroit, Michilimackinac and Fort Miami, where ſuch repairs and additions have been ordered to be made as appeared indiſpenſable.

The commiſſioners appointed on the part of the United States and of Great Britain, to determine which is the river St. Croix, mentioned in the treaty of peace of 1783, agreed in the choice of Egbert Benſon, Eſq. of New York, for the third commiſſioner. The whole met at St. Andrew's, in Paſſamaquody Bay, in the beginning of October, and directed ſurveys to be made of the rivers in diſpute; but deeming it impracticable to have theſe ſurveys completed before the next year, they adjourned, to meet at Boſton in Auguſt 1797, for the final deciſion of the queſtion.

Other commiſſioners appointed on the part of the United States, agreeably to the ſeventh article of the treaty with Great Britain, relative to captures and condemnation of veſſels and other property, met the commiſſioners of his Britannic Majeſty in London, in Auguſt laſt, when John Trumbull, Eſq. was choſen by lot, for the fifth commiſſioner. In October following, the board were to proceed to buſineſs. As yet, there has been no communication of commiſſioners on the part of Great Britain, to unite with thoſe who have been appointed on the part of the United States, for carrying into effect the ſixth article of the treaty.

The treaty with Spain required that the commiſſioners for running the boundary line between the territory of the United States and his Catholic Majeſty's provinces of Eaſt and Weſt Florida, ſhould meet at the Natchez before the expiration of ſix months after the exchange of the ratifications, which was effected at Aranjuez on the twenty-fifth day of April; and the troops of his Catholic Majeſty, occupying any poſts within the limits of the United States, were within the ſame period to be withdrawn. — The commiſſioner of the United States, therefore, commenced his journey for the Natchez in September, and troops were ordered to occupy the poſts from which the Spaniſh garriſons ſhould be withdrawn. Information has been recently received of the appointment of a commiſſioner on the part of his Catholic

Majeſty, for running the boundary line; but none of any appointment for the adjuſtment of the claims of our citizens, whoſe veſſels were captured by the armed veſſels of Spain.

In purſuance of the act of Congreſs paſſed in the laſt ſeſſion, for the protection and relief of American ſeamen, agents were appointed; one to reſide in Great Britain, and the other in the Weſt Indies. The effects of the agency in the Weſt Indies are not yet fully aſcertained, but thoſe which have been communicated, afford grounds to believe the meaſure will be beneficial. The agent deſtined to reſide in Great Britain declining to accept the appointment, the buſineſs has conſequently devolved on the minſter of the United States, in London, and will command his attention until a new agent ſhall be appointed.

After many delays and diſappointments ariſing out of the European war, the final arrangements for fulfilling the engagements made to the Dey and Regency of Algiers, will, in all preſent appearance, be crowned with ſucceſs; but under great, though inevitable, diſadvantages in the pecuniary tranſactions, occaſioned by that war; which will render a further proviſion neceſſary. The actual liberation of all our citizens who were priſoners in Algiers, while it gratifies every feeling heart, is itſelf an earneſt of a ſatisfactory termination of the whole negociation. Meaſures are in operation for effecting treaties with the Regencies of Tunis and Tripoli.

To an active external commerce, the protection of a naval force is indiſpenſable. This is manifeſt with regard to wars in which a ſtate is itſelf a party. But beſides this, it is in our own experience that the moſt ſincere neutrality is not a ſufficient guard againſt the depredations of nations at war. To ſecure reſpect to a neutral flag, requires a naval force, organized and ready to vindicate it from inſult or aggreſſion. This may even prevent the neceſſity of going to war, by diſcouraging belligerent powers from committing ſuch violations of the rights of the neutral party, as may, firſt or laſt, leave no other option. From the beſt information I have been able to obtain, it would ſeem as if our trade to the Mediterranean, without a protecting force, will always be inſecure; and our citizens expoſed to the calamities from which numbers of them have but juſt been relieved.

Theſe conſiderations invite the United States to look to the means, and to ſet about the gradual creation of a navy. The increaſing progreſs of their navigation promiſes them, at no diſtant period, the requiſite ſupply of ſeamen; and their means, in other reſpects, favour the undertaking. It is an encouragment likewiſe, that their particular ſituation will give weight and influence to a moderate naval force in their hands. Will it not then be adviſeable to begin without delay to provide and lay up the materials for the building and equipping of ſhips of war; and to proceed in the work by degrees, in proportion as our reſources ſhall render it practicable without inconvenience; ſo that a future war of Europe may not find our commerce in the ſame unprotected ſtate in which it was found by the preſent?

Congreſs have repeatedly, and not without ſucceſs, directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures. The object is of too much conſequence not to enſure a continuance of their efforts in every way which ſhall appear eligible. As a general rule, manufactures on public account are inexpedient. But where the ſtate of things in a country leaves little hope that certain branches of manufacture will for a great length of time obtain; when theſe are of a nature eſſential to the furniſhing and equipping of the public force in time of war; are not eſtabliſhments for procuring them on public account, *to the extent of the ordinary demand for the public ſervice*, recommended by ſtrong conſiderations of national policy, as an exception to the general rule? Ought our country to remain in ſuch caſes dependent on foreign ſupply, precarious, becauſe liable to be interrupted?

If the neceſſary articles ſhould in this mode coſt more in time of peace, will not the ſecurity and independence thence ariſing, form an ample compenſation? Eſtabliſhments of this ſort, commenſurate only with the calls of the public ſervice in time of peace, will, in time of war, eaſily be extended in proportion to the exigencies of the government; and may even perhaps be made to yield a ſurplus for the ſupply of our citizens at large, ſo as to mitigate the privations from the interruptions of their trade. If adopted, the plan ought to exclude all thoſe branches which are already, or likely ſoon to be, eſtabliſhed in the country, in order that there may be no danger of interference with purſuits of individual induſtry.

It will not be doubted, that with reverence either to individual or national welfare, agriculture is of primary importance. In proportion as nations advance in population, and other circumſtances of maturity, this truth becomes more apparent; and renders the cultivation of the ſoil more and more an object of public patronage. Inſtitutions for promoting it grow up, ſupported by the public purſe: and to what object can it be dedicated with greater propriety? Among the means which have been employed to this end, none have been attended with greater ſucceſs than the eſtabliſhment of Boards, compoſed of proper characters, charged with collecting and diffuſing information, and enabled, by premiums and ſmall pecuniary aids, to encourage and aſſiſt a ſpirit of diſcovery and improvement.—This ſpecies of eſtabliſhment contributes doubly to the increaſe of improvement, by ſtimulating to enterprize and experiment, and by drawing to a common centre the reſults everywhere of individual ſkill and obſervation, and ſpreading them thence over the whole nation. Experience accordingly has ſhewn, that they are very cheap inſtruments of immenſe national benefits.

I have heretofore propoſed to the conſideration of Congreſs, the expediency of eſtabliſhing a National Univerſity; and alſo a Military Academy. The deſireableneſs of both theſe inſtitutions, as ſo conſtantly increaſed with every new view I have taken of the ſubject, that I cannot omit the opportunity of, once for all, recalling your attention to them.

The assembly to which I address myself, is too enlightened not to be fully sensible how much a flourishing state of the arts and sciences contributes to national prosperity and reputation. True it is, that our country, much to its honour, contains many seminaries of learning, highly respectable and useful; but the funds upon which they rest, are too narrow to command the ablest professors in the different departments of liberal knowledge, for the institution contemplated, though they would be excellent auxiliaries.

Amongst the motives to such an institution, the assimilation of the principles, opinions, and manners of our countrymen, by the common education of a portion of our youth from every quarter, well deserves attention. The more homogeneous our citizens can be made in these particulars, the greater will be our prospect of permanent union; and a primary object of such a national institution should be, the education of our youth in the science of *government*. In a republic, what species of knowledge can be equally important? And what duty more pressing on its legislature, than to patronize a plan for communicating it to those who are to be the future guardians of the liberties of the country?

The institution of a military academy, is also recommended by cogent reasons. However pacific the general policy of a nation may be, it ought never to be without an adequate stock of military knowledge for emergencies. The first would impair the energy of its character, and both would hazard its safety, or expose it to greater evils when war could not be avoided: besides, that war might often not depend upon its own choice. In proportion as the observance of pacific maxims might exempt a nation from the necessity of practising the rules of the military art, ought to be its care in preserving and transmitting by proper establishments, the knowledge of that art. Whatever argument may be drawn from particular examples, superficially viewed, a thorough examination of the subject will evince, that the art of war is at once comprehensive and complicated; that it demands much previous study; and that the possession of it, in its most improved and perfect state, is always of great moment to the security of a nation. This, therefore, ought to be a serious care of every government; and for this purpose, an academy, where a regular course of instruction is given, is an obvious expedient, which different nations have successfully employed.

The compensations to the officers of the United States, in various instances, and in none more than in respect to the most important stations, appear to call for legislative revision. The consequences of a defective provision are of serious import to the government. If private wealth is to supply the defect of public retribution, it will greatly contract the sphere within which the selection of character for office is to be made; and will proportionally diminish the probability of a choice of men, able as well as upright. Besides that, it would be repugnant to the vital principles of our government, virtually to exclude from public trusts, talents and virtue, unless accompanied by wealth.

While in our external relations ſome ſerious inconveniences and embarraſſments have been overcome, and others leſſened, it is with much pain and deeper regret, I mention that circumſtances of a very unwelcome nature have lately occurred. Our trade has ſuffered, and is ſuffering extenſive injuries in the Weſt Indies, from the cruizers and agents of the French republic; and communications have been received from its miniſter here, which indicate the danger of a further diſturbance of our commerce by its authority; and which are, in other reſpects, far from agreeable.

It has been my conſtant, ſincere, and earneſt wiſh, in conformity with that of our nation, to maintain cordial harmony, and a perfectly friendly underſtanding with that republic. This wiſh remains unabated; and I ſhall perſevere in the endeavour to fulfil it to the utmoſt extent of what ſhall be conſiſtent with a juſt and indiſpenſable regard to the rights and honour of our country; nor will I eaſily ceaſe to cheriſh the expectation, that a ſpirit of juſtice, candour, and friendſhip, on the part of the republic, will eventually enſure ſucceſs.

In purſuing this courſe, however, I cannot forget what is due to the character of our government and nation; or to a full and entire confidence in the good ſenſe, patriotiſm, ſelf-reſpect, and fortitude of my countrymen.

I reſerve for a ſpecial meſſage, a more particular communication on this intereſting ſubject.

Gentlemen of the Houſe of Repreſentatives,

I have directed an eſtimate of the appropriations neceſſary for the ſervice of the enſuing year, to be ſubmitted from the proper department; with a view of the public receipts and expenditures to the lateſt period to which an account can be prepared.

It is with ſatisfaction I am able to inform you, that the revenues of the United States continue in a ſtate of progreſſive improvement.

A reinforcement of the exiſting proviſions for diſcharging our public debt, was mentioned in my addreſs at the opening of the laſt ſeſſion. Some preliminary ſteps were taken towards it; the maturing of which will, no doubt, engage your zealous attention during the preſent. I will only add, that it will afford me a heartfelt ſatisfaction to concur in ſuch further meaſures as will aſcertain to our country the proſpect of a ſpeedy extinguiſhment of the debt. Poſterity may have cauſe to regret, if, from any motive, intervals of tranquillity are left unimproved for accelerating this valuable end.

Gentlemen of the Senate, and of the Houſe of Repreſentatives,

My ſolicitude to ſee the militia of the United States placed on an efficient eſtabliſhment, has been ſo often and ſo ardently expreſſed, that I ſhall but barely recall the ſubject to your view on the preſent occaſion; at the ſame time that I ſhall ſubmit to your enquiry, whether our harbours are yet ſufficiently ſecured.

The ſituation in which I now ſtand, for the laſt time, in the midſt of the repreſentatives of the people of the United States, naturally recalls the period when the adminiſtration of the preſent form of government commenced; and I cannot omit the occaſion to congratulate you and my country on the ſucceſs of the experiment; nor to repeat my ſupplication to the Supreme Ruler of the univerſe, and Sovereign Arbiter of nations, that his providential care may ſtill be extended to the United States; that the virtue and happineſs of the people may be preſerved; and that the government, which they have inſtituted for the protection of their liberties, may be perpetual.

THE ANSWER OF THE SENATE.

WE thank you, Sir, for your faithful and detailed expoſure of the exiſting ſituation of our country; and we ſincerely join in ſentiments of gratitude to an over-ruling Providence, for the diſtinguiſhed ſhare of public proſperity and private happineſs which the people of the United States ſo peculiarly enjoy.

We are fully ſenſible of the advantages that have reſulted from the adoption of meaſures (which you have ſucceſsfully carried into effect) to preſerve peace, cultivate friendſhip, and promote civilization, among the Indian tribes on the weſtern frontiers. Feelings of humanity, and the moſt ſolid political principles, equally encourage the continuance of this ſyſtem.

We obſerve with pleaſure, that the delivery of the military poſts, lately occupied by the Britiſh forces, within the territory of the United States, was made with cordiality and promptitude, as ſoon as circumſtances would admit; and that the other proviſions of our treaties with Great Britain and Spain, that were objects of eventual arrangement, are about being carried into effect, with entire harmony and good faith.

The unfortunate but unavoidable difficulties that oppoſed a timely compliance with the terms of the Algerine treaty, are much to be lamented, as they may occaſion a temporary ſuſpenſion of the advantages to be derived from a ſolid peace with that power, and a perfect ſecurity from its predatory warfare; at the ſame time, the lively impreſſions that affected the public mind on the redemption of our captive

fellow-citizens, afford the moſt laudable incentive to our exertions to remove the remaining obſtacles.

We perfectly coincide with you in opinion, That the importance of our commerce demands a naval force for its protection againſt foreign inſult and depredation; and our ſolicitude to attain that object will be always proportionate to its magnitude.

The neceſſity of accelerating the eſtabliſhment of certain uſeful manufactures, by the intervention of legiſlative aid and protection, and the encouragement due to agriculture, by the creation of Boards (compoſed of intelligent individuals) to patronize this primary purſuit of ſociety, are ſubjects which will readily engage our moſt ſerious attention.

A national univerſity may be converted to the moſt uſeful purpoſes: the ſcience of legiſlation being ſo eſſentially dependent on the endowments of the mind, the public intereſt muſt receive effectual aid from the general diffuſion of knowledge; and the United States will aſſume a more dignified ſtation among the nations of the earth, by the ſucceſsful cultivation of the higher branches of literature.

A military academy may be likewiſe rendered equally important. To aid and direct the phyſical force of the nation, by cheriſhing a military ſpirit, enforcing a proper ſenſe of diſcipline, and inculcating a ſcientific ſyſtem of tactics, is conſonant to the ſoundeſt maxims of public policy. Connected with and ſupported by ſuch an eſtabliſhment, a well regulated militia, conſtituting the national defence of the country, would prove the moſt effectual, as well as the œconomical preſervative of peace.

We cannot but conſider, with ſerious apprehenſions, the inadequate compenſations of public officers, eſpecially of thoſe in the more important ſtations. It is not only a violation of the ſpirit of a public contract, but is an evil ſo extenſive in its operation, and ſo deſtructive in its conſequences, that we truſt it will receive the moſt pointed legiſlative attention.

We ſincerely lament that, whilſt the conduct of the United States has been uniformly impreſſed with the character of equity, moderation, and love of peace, in the maintenance of all their foreign relationſhips, our trade ſhould be ſo harraſſed by the cruizers and agents of the republic of France, throughout the extenſive departments of the Weſt Indies.

Whilſt we are confident that no cauſe of complaint exiſts that could authorize an interruption of our tranquillity, or diſengage that republic from the bonds of amity, cemented by the faith of treaties, we cannot but expreſs our deepeſt regret, that official communications have been made to you, indicating a more ſerious diſturbance of our commerce. Although we cheriſh the expectation that a ſenſe of juſtice and a conſideration of our mutual intereſts, will moderate their

councils, we are not unmindful of the ſituation in which events may place us, nor unprepared to adopt that ſyſtem of conduct which, compatible with the dignity of a reſpectable nation, neceſſity may compel us to purſue.

We cordially acquieſce in the reflection, that the United States, under the operation of the federal government, have experienced a moſt rapid aggrandizement and proſperity, as well political as commercial.

Whilſt contemplating the cauſes that produce this auſpicious reſult, we much acknowledge the excellence of the conſtitutional ſyſtem, and the wiſdom of the legiſlative proviſions;—but we ſhould be deficient in gratitude and juſtice, did we not attribute a great portion of theſe advantages to the virtue, firmneſs, and talents of your adminiſtration; which have been conſpicuouſly diſplayed in the moſt trying times, and on the moſt critical occaſions. It is, therefore, with the ſincereſt regret that we now receive an official notification of your intentions to retire from the public employments of your country.

When we review the various ſcenes of your public life, ſo long and ſo ſucceſsfully devoted to the moſt arduous ſervices, civil and military,—as well during the ſtruggles of the American revolution as the convulſive periods of a recent date, we cannot look forward to your retirement without our warmeſt affections and moſt anxious regards accompanying you; and without mingling with our fellow-citizens at large, the ſincereſt wiſhes for your perſonal happineſs that ſenſibility and attachment can expreſs.

The moſt effectual conſolation that can offer for the loſs we are about to ſuſtain, ariſes from the animating reflection, that the influence of your example will extend to your ſucceſſors; and the United States thus continue to enjoy, an able, upright, and energetic adminiſtration.

THE ANSWER
OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR,

THE Houſe of Repreſentatives have attended to your communication reſpecting the ſtate of our country, with all the ſenſibility that the contemplation of the ſubject and a ſenſe of duty can inſpire.

We are gratified by the information, that meaſures calculated to enſure a continuance of the friendſhip of the Indians, and to maintain the tranquillity of the *weſtern* frontier, have been adopted; and we indulge the hope that theſe, by impreſſing the Indian tribes with more correct conceptions of the juſtice, as well as power of the United States, will be attended with ſucceſs.

While we notice, with ſatisfaction, the ſteps that you have taken in purſuance of the late treaties with ſeveral foreign nations, the liberation of our citizens, who were priſoners at Algiers, is a ſubject of peculiar felicitation. We ſhall cheerfully co-operate in any further meaſures that ſhall appear, on conſideration, to be requiſite.

We have ever concurred with you in the moſt ſincere and uniform diſpoſition to preſerve our neutral relations inviolate; and it is, of courſe, with anxiety and deep regret we hear that any interruption of our harmony with the French Republic has occurred: for we feel with you and with our conſtituents the cordial and unabated wiſh to maintain a perfectly friendly underſtanding with that nation. Your endeavours to fulfil that wiſh, and by all honourable means to preſerve peace and to reſtore that harmony and affection which have heretofore ſo happily ſubſiſted between the French Republic and the United States, cannot fail, therefore, to intereſt our attention. And while we participate in the full reliance you have expreſſed on the patriotiſm, ſelf-reſpect, and fortitude of our countrymen, we cheriſh the pleaſing hope, that a mutual ſpirit of juſtice and moderation will enſure the ſucceſs of your perſeverance.

The various ſubjects of your communication will, reſpectively, meet with the attention that is due to their importance.

When we advert to the internal ſituation of the United States, we deem it equally natural and becoming to compare the preſent period with that immediately antecedent to the operation of the government, and to contraſt it with the calamities in which the ſtate of war ſtill involves ſeveral of the European nations, as the reflections deduced from both tend to juſtify, as well as to excite, a warmer admiration of our free conſtitution, and to exalt our minds to a more fervent and grateful ſenſe of piety towards Almighty God for the beneficence of his providence, by which its adminiſtration has been hitherto ſo remarkably diſtinguiſhed.

And while we entertain a grateful conviction that your wiſe, firm, and patriotic adminiſtration has been ſignally conducive to the ſucceſs of the preſent form of government, we cannot forbear to expreſs the deep ſenſations of regret with which we contemplate your intended retirement from office.

As no other ſuitable occaſion may occur, we cannot ſuffer the preſent to paſs without attempting to diſcloſe ſome of the emotions which it cannot fail to awaken.

The gratitude and admiration of your countrymen are ſtill drawn to the recollection of thoſe reſplendent virtues and talents which were ſo eminently inſtrumental to the atchievement of the revolution, and of which that glorious event will ever be the memorial. Your obedience to the voice of duty and your country, when you quitted reluctantly, a ſecond time, the retreat you had choſen, and firſt accepted the Preſidency, afforded a new proof of the devotedneſs of

your zeal in its ſervice, and an earneſt of the patriotiſm and ſucceſs which have characterized your adminiſtration. As the grateful confidence of the citizens in the virtues of their chief magiſtrate, has eſſentially contributed to that ſucceſs, we perſuade ourſelves that the millions whom we repreſent, participate with us in the anxious ſolicitudes of the preſent occaſion.

Yet we cannot be unmindful that your moderation and magnanimity, twice diſplayed by retiring from your exalted ſtations, afford examples no leſs rare and inſtructive to mankind, than valuable to a republic.

Although we are ſenſible that this event, of itſelf, completes the luſtre of a character already conſpicuouſly unrivalled by the coincidence of virtue, talents, ſucceſs, and public eſtimation, yet we conceive we owe it to you, Sir, and ſtill more emphatically to ourſelves and to our nation (of the language of whoſe hearts we preſume to think ourſelves at this moent the faithful interpreters) to expreſs the ſentiments with which it is contemplated.

The ſpectacle of a free and enlightened nation offering by its repreſentatives the tribute of unfeigned approbation to its firſt citizen, however novel and intereſting it may be, derives all its luſtre (a luſtre which accident or enthuſiaſm could not beſtow, and which adulation would tarniſh) from the tranſcendent merit of which it is the voluntary teſtimony.

May you long enjoy that liberty which is ſo dear to you, and to which your name will ever be ſo dear! May your own virtues and a nation's prayers obtain the happieſt ſunſhine for the decline of your days and the choiceſt of future bleſſings! For our country's ſake, for the ſake of republican liberty, it is our earneſt wiſh that your example may be the guide of your ſucceſſors; and thus, after being the ornament and ſafeguard of the preſent age, become the patrimony of our deſcendants.

THIS ANSWER, on which there was a pretty long and warm debate, is ſomewhat different from that which was firſt propoſed by the committee appointed to draw it up. Some members were oppoſed to almoſt every part of it; but their oppoſition was more directly levelled againſt three particular points; the compliment to the Preſident, the paragraph reſpecting the miſunderſtand-

ing with the French Republic, and the expreſſion of the free and enlightened ſtate of the American people.

That a compliment to the Preſident, or rather a faint acknowledgment of his virtues and ſervices (for on this ſubject any acknowledgment muſt be faint) ſhould be oppoſed in the Congreſs of the United States, would be cauſe of great mortification to every generous and grateful mind, were it not accompanied with the conſoling reflection, that *Mr. Giles* was at the head of the oppoſition. There are certain perſons, whoſe applauſe we ſhun with as much ſolicitude as we ſeek for that of others; and I muſt confeſs, there are few men in the world whoſe praiſes I ſhould dread more than thoſe of the Virginian Giles; and I dare ſay the Preſident is very happy to think that he has eſcaped them.

The Anſwer expreſſes a grateful conviction of the Preſident's *wiſe*, *firm*, and *patriotic* adminiſtration, and regrets his departure from office. To all this the virtuous and upright Mr. Giles objected. He ſaid, that "the Preſident's adminiſtration had been neither *wiſe* nor *firm*; and as to his departure from office, he felt not the leaſt regret on account of it. He hoped he would retire to his country-ſeat, and live comfortably there. He believed the government of the United States would go on without him. *The people* were competent to their *own* government. That for thoſe, who had oppoſed ſome of the principal meaſures of the Preſident, to vote for the Anſwer in its preſent form, would be *writing Scoundrel on their foreheads.*

It would be uſeleſs to take up mine and my reader's time in a juſtification of the compliment to which Mr. Giles was oppoſed. The people of the United States, from one end of the Union to the other, have unequivocally expreſſed what this gentleman is afraid to expreſs, leſt thereby he ſhould write *Scoundrel* on his forehead. If the reader will look back to the *Cenſor* for April laſt, he will find this ſame patriot declaring, that he *adored* the voice of the people; and yet he has now the temerity to doubt its infallibility, to refuſe obedience to it, even to mutiny againſt and offer reſiſtance to its *awful* commands. If ever I derived an extraordinary degree of ſatisfaction from the embarraſſment of others, it was on ſeeing Mr. Giles and his brother patriots, the votaries of the popular voice, reduced to take the *unpopular* ſide of a queſtion. The leader ſeems to have been ſenſible of the awkwardneſs of his ſituation, when he ſaid that "*the people* are competent to their *own* "government." This was a kind of palliative; it was ſhifting the ground of oppoſition; it was a poor miſerable attempt to preſerve conſiſtency, and betrayed either a total want of diſcernment in the ſpeaker, or a conſummate contempt for the underſtandings of the people; for, if the people are competent to their own government, they are certainly competent to form a judgment of the conduct of the Preſident; and as they have declared his adminiſtration to be wiſe, firm, and patriotic, how dared their zealous and pious adorer to ſay they are miſtaken?

As to *writing Scoundrel on his front*, of which Mr. Giles ſeemed to entertain ſuch unneceſſary fears; if the appproving of the compliment in queſtion would produce this effect, all the members

of the ſtate legiſlatures, and nine-tenths of their conſtituents, had already taken the hideous inſcription. What a ſcoundrelly god, then, does Mr. Giles adore! If an obſtinate oppoſition to all the moſt important meaſures of an adminiſtration, which the anſwer approves of in the aggregate, was calculated to imprint the terrific word, voting for the Anſwer could do no more than render eligible what was already written; as characters in certain liquids remain imperceptible till drawn forth by the fire. Mr. Giles and his fellow-labourers prudently ſhrank from the ordeal; but they will excuſe us, if our imaginations ſhould ſupply its place. Read we aſſuredly ſhall; and it will be nothing very extraordinary if we ſhould extend the ſignification of every term that we think we perceive.

The next ſubject of oppoſition was the paragraph which ſpeaks of the miſunderſtanding with the bloody Gallican Republic. In the reported Anſwer it ſtood thus: "We have ever concurred "with you in the moſt ſincere and uniform diſ-"poſition to preſerve our mutual relations invio-"late, and it is, of courſe, with anxiety and deep "regret we hear that any interruption of our har-"mony with the French Republic has occurred: "for we feel with you, and with our conſtituents, "the cordial and unabated wiſh to maintain a "perfectly friendly underſtanding with that na-"tion. Your endeavours to fulfil that wiſh can-"not fail therefore to intereſt our attention. And "while we participate in the full reliance you "have expreſſed on the patriotiſm, ſelf-reſpect, "and fortitude of our countrymen, we cheriſh "the pleaſing hope, that a ſpirit of juſtice and

" moderation will enſure the ſucceſs of your per-
" ſeverance."

This was certainly tame enough, after all the outrages and inſults of France. The deſire to re-eſtabliſh harmony is expreſſed, as *Mr. Ames* obſerved, with little leſs ardour than the requeſts of a ſupplicating lover; and the confidence in the ſpirit of the country, in caſe of an appeal to arms, is diſguiſed with as much care, as if it were a crime to be courageous in oppoſing the violence and reſenting the indignities of a horde of baſe-born grovelling tyrants.

How different from this heſitating tone was that of the Senate: " We are," ſay they, " not un-
" mindful of the ſituation in which events may
" place us, *nor unprepared to adopt that ſyſtem of*
" *conduct which, compatible with the dignity of a*
" *reſpectable nation, neceſsity may compel us to pur-*
" *ſue.*" This manly anſwer does infinite honour to the man who penned it; and let the inſolent convention recollect, that it was approved of by him with whom they will in future be obliged to treat.

The Anſwer of the Senate was all that could be wiſhed, but it ſhould have been ſurpaſſed in warmth by thoſe who call themſelves the *immediate* repreſentatives of the people. Language that may be extremely proper, at ſuch a criſis, from cool and diſpaſſionate Senators, whoſe buſineſs is rather to check than to encourage the ardour of the public ſpirit, may be poor and cold when coming from the Repreſentatives. Every ſentence from them ſhould have ſmoked with indignation at the inſupportable inſolence of the French; they

ſhould have declared, that they were ready with their lives to defend that independence which had been ſo openly attacked, and to ſupport the government in every energetic meaſure it ſhould take to obtain ſatisfaction for the indignities that had been heaped on it. Yet, ſo far from this was the conduct of the Houſe, that even the paragraph above quoted was not humble enough for them: not content with expreſſing their *anxiety* and *deep regret* at the interruption of *harmony*, and their *unabtaed* wiſh to maintain a *perfectly friendly* underſtanding with the nation who had robbed, deſpiſed, and openly inſulted them and their country, they muſt needs add another ſentence, wiſhing for the reſtoration of that *harmony* and *affection* which had hitherto ſo *happily* ſubſiſted. Not content with amplifying their tremulous accents till the quaver had loſt the ſound of manhood, they muſt needs begin *da Capo*, and repeat the faultering tune. Nay, the laſt ſentence of the paragraph, which ſpeaks of a ſpirit of *juſtice* and *moderation*, could not paſs without being crammed with the word *mutual*. Mr. Giles, indeed, wiſhed to tack another phraſe; *viz.* "*on* "*the part of the Republic*," to the end of this word "*mutual*." He ſeemed to think that the anſwer would be incomplete without a little *nonſenſe*:— "That a *mutual* ſpirit of juſtice and moderation "*on the part of the Republic* will enſure the ſucceſs "of your perſeverance." — If you can go to the Sunday-ſchools round the city, and find me a boy, out of his Primer, ſtupid and illiterate enough to compoſe a ſentence like this, I will be bound to find you men in Virginia who ſhall vote him into Congreſs.—"*The* Republic," too. *What* Republic? Is not America a Republic as well as France? The French King forbade his ſubjects to addreſs

him, or ſpeak of him, under any other name than ſimply that of *the* King, as if there were but one king in the world; juſt as we ſpeak of the Sun or Moon. The deſpots who have cut his throat, ſeem to have taken poſſeſſion of his vanity as well as of his houſes, his gardens, his coaches, and his jewels. They call their poor beggared enſlaved country *the* Republic. But other kingdoms never obſerved this ſtile of eminence towards the French monarch, nor will it be obſerved towards the French Republic, I truſt, by any other Republic, or any other mortal, except Mr. Giles. It would ſeem that the gentleman forgot where he was, and looked upon himſelf as a repreſentative of the ſwarthy French, inſtead of the more humane and more enlightened, though ſooty, citizens of the ancient dominion.

The imagination of this man, and of all thoſe who voted with him, appears to have been upon the rack to find out terms expreſſive of their dependence on the generoſity and magnanimity of the inſulting foe, and of their want of confidence in the people of this country. Was this what the Preſident expected, when he complained to them of the aggreſſions of the French, and of the threats he had received from their miniſter? Was this what the people expected, when that inſolent miniſter appealed to them from their government? No; they expected no ſuch milk-ſop tautology. They expected a good, plain, and reſolute tone, calculated to convince the treacherous French that their independence was not a mere name; and that, while a deſire of peace dwelt in their breaſts, fear of a war found no place there.

It was ſaid by thoſe who oppoſed the introduction of that redundancy of *affection* which now diſhonours the Anſwer, that the firſt draught was dictated by a ſpirit of accommodation; and, indeed, this was evidently the caſe, for no one who knows Meſſrs. Ames and Sitgreaves, and reads their animated ſpeeches in the debate, will believe that this draught was dictated by their feelings. My complaiſance, however, would not have carried me ſo far; I would have ſtood alone in the Houſe; I would have oppoſed every ſentence, every word, and every ſyllable that favoured of tameneſs, that indicated a reliance on the *juſtice* and *moderation* of the French, or a fear of encountering their diſpleaſure.

The third ſubject of oppoſition was, that ſentence in the Anſwer which ſtyles the people of America "the freeſt and moſt enlightened in the "world." And who could help being ſurpriſed that the *adorer* of the *people* ſhould take the lead here alſo! One would imagine, that, to be proper objects of adoration, they ſhould at leaſt be the moſt free and enlightened in the world; unleſs we ſuppoſe that Mr. Giles adored them for their purity and virtue, which there is very little reaſon to do.

Theſe words were at laſt changed for "a free "and enlightened people." The cauſe of this (with ſhame be it ſpoken) was *fear of offending the French Convention*, an aſſembly that every worthy American longs to ſpit upon; an aſſembly whoſe approbation is a mark of diſhonour ten thouſand times greater than ſtanding in the pillory, or being burnt in the hand. Talk of writing Scoundrel in the forehead! I would ſooner bear

the word Scoundrel as a motto round the pupils of my eyes, than be blaſted with the approving grin of a gang of aſſaſſins.

That the cauſe of the oppoſition was what I have ſtated it, muſt be clear to every one who recollects the language of the members who took a part in it on other occaſions. There is hardly a people in Europe, except the French, whom they have not, at different times, ſince the preſent war, repreſented as buried in ſlavery and brutal ignorance. They inſiſted that the Houſe had no right to caſt reflections on foreign nations; what right had Mr. Giles, then, to caſt reflections on the government and parliament of Britain? What right had another member to call the Empreſs of Ruſſia a ſhe-bear; another, the King of Great Britain a robber; and another, all kings in general a herd of crowned monſters? "The fact "may be true," ſaid they, "but we have no right "to ſtep beyond the boundaries of our own coun- "try to contraſt it with any other." Now, what did the pretty Mr. Livingſton, who was one of theſe inoffenſive and modeſt gentlemen, do laſt ſeſſion? — "Great Britain," ſaid he, "was *once* "free; but now Great Britain, and *all Europe*, "France *excepted*, is *in chains!*"—Was this ſtepping beyond the boundary line? This was not being content with eulogium on America, but was openly inſulting every nation of Europe, *except the French*, the *free* and *enlightened* heroes of the *Bloody Buoy*. But, why need we go back to paſt ſeſſions, when in the preſent one, and even in this debate, and on this very queſtion we hear the delicate Mr. Parker exclaim, "Kingcraft and "prieſtcraft have too long governed the world "with an iron rod: more enlightened times, I

" truſt, are approaching; and I hope ere long *re-*
" *publicaniſm* will cover the earth." — Like the univerſal deluge I ſuppoſe.

It is pretty clear from this ſally of Mr. Parker, that no nations were to be excepted but thoſe who are, or call themſelves, Republics. This might have done very well, and the Anſwer might have been thus amended with ſome little conſiſtency, but poor Mr. Parker has a ſhort memory, and being preſſed hard by Mr. William Smith, who truly aſſerted that fear of giving umbrage to the French was at the bottom of the oppoſition, he tacked ſhort about, and ran headlong into the moſt monſtrous contradiction that ever bemired a poor orator.—" No;" ſaid he, " I have not the " French republic, or any other nation in view; " the Swiſs Cantons have ſhown themſelves more " enlightened than we." — All was well yet, but Mr. Parker, like moſt other eloquent men, is very fond of enumeration, and he unfortunately added the *Danes and Swedes*. Theſe nations alſo, he ſaid, were more enlightened than the people of America, though, in the ſame ſpeech he declared that *Kingcraft* had too long governed the world with an iron rod; and hoped that more enlightened times were at hand, and that republicaniſm would ſoon cover the earth! He could not be ſo very ignorant, or at leaſt I ſhould ſuppoſe ſo, as not to know that Denmark and Sweden are governed by kings; but he was hemmed up in a corner, and did not know where to look for more enlightened republics than his own, *except France*. ——A legiſlator ſhould always underſtand geography and aſtronomy, and then " his eye in a " fine fit of frenzy rolling," might, as Doctor Ruſh ſays Rittenhouſe did, find out republics in the moon. However, a very little ſtudy of the

former ſcience might have led Mr. Parker, in his jump from Switzerland to Denmark, to perceive the dear ſifter republic of *Batavia*. Here he might have found a triumphant compariſon. Republicaniſm has enlightened the Dutch with a vengeance. The Sans Culottes have worn them down till you may read a newſpaper through their ribs. *Geneva* too, which was ſo near him when he was got among the Swiſs, might, one would have thought, have claimed a preference to Denmark and Sweden; particularly as the cheering rays of republicaniſm have been communicated to it by the great luminary which ſeems to be the ſole object of his admiration.

Mr. Parker moved for ſtriking out the words, "freeſt and moſt enlightened." This Mr. Chriſtie propoſed to amend, by inſerting, "free-eſt, "and *amongſt* the moſt enlightened;" but ſtill Mr. Swanwick thought the word "*amongſt*" ſhould come before, inſtead of after "*free-eſt*; becauſe "nothing could tend more to *preſerve the peace* "of the country, than *treating others with re-* "*ſpect*;" and in this opinion he was joined by Meſſrs. Coit and Dayton, the latter of whom moſt humbly thought, that "the amendment very "much *ſoftened* the terms, and rendered them "*more palatable*." —— At laſt, after theſe four words had undergone juſt as many changes as can be rung upon four bells, the peal was cloſed with "*free* and *enlightened* people."

Gracious Heaven! and have I lived to hear the American Congreſs, men whoſe brow I had been taught to believe *independence* had made its choſen ſeat, haggling three whole days about four words of compliment to their country, and at laſt ex-

punge them, leſt they ſhould give offence to a foreign nation! Mr. Livingſton and the newſmonger Brown may dun us as long as they pleaſe about the ſlavery of Britons, but if a member of their Houſe of Commons were timid enough to expreſs his *fears* at calling his nation the free-eſt and moſt enlightened in the world, I flatter myſelf he would never dare ſhow his face again in that aſſembly. For a nation, which dares not paſs on itſelf whatever compliment or encomium it pleaſes, to call itſelf *free* and *independent*, is an abuſe of words that nothing can be a ſufficient puniſhment for, except the conſciouſneſs of being, and of being thought, exactly the contrary of what it ſtrives to appear.

That the amendment ſhould be adopted at all, is a circumſtance in itſelf ſufficiently humiliating; but, when we conſider that it was adopted for fear of giving umbrage to France; when we conſider that the repreſentatives of the people thought it unfitting to declare them more *free* and *enlightened* than the baſe, the willing ſlaves, the brutiſhly ignorant and illiterate wretches left in the French territory, we feel our ſuperiority inſulted, and deſpiſe the man who would ſhrink from the declaration.

In that *free* country, France, the parent dares not yield protection to his child, nor the child to his parent, without the previous conſent of ſome petty underſtrapping deſpot. Man poſſeſſes nothing; his property belongs to a mob of tyrants, who call themſelves the nation, who hold his labour and his very carcaſe in a ſtate of requiſition. If his griefs break out into complaint, he is dragged to a tribunal, where *no evidence is required*. A

ſhrug, a look, a tear, or a ſigh, betrays him. To repine at the cruelty of his fate, is to be ſuſpected; and to be ſuſpected, is death.

We need not ſtretch our view acroſs the Atlantic for ſpecimens of French liberty; we may ſee enough without quitting our own country, or even our houſes. The *cockade proclamation* of Citizen Adet is at once an inſult to the United States, and an act of abominable tyranny on the unfortunate French who have taken a refuge in them. They muſt not only ſuffer ſhame for their country, but muſt bear about them the ſign of its diſgrace, the livery of the infamous Orleans. They muſt not only be deſpoiled of their wealth, and driven from their homes and their families, but muſt drag their chains into diſtant lands. It is not enough that they ſhould be branded with the name of ſlave; they muſt wear the ſymbol of their ſlavery, and that, too, exactly where other men wear the ſymbol of courage and honour!—Will not the people of America bluſh to think that their repreſentatives were afraid to aſſert that they enjoyed a degree of freedom ſuperior to this?

Of the *enlightened* people, now called the French nation, not one out of five hundred can ſpell his own name. As to religion, four years ago they were ſeen kneeling with their faces prone to the earth, blubbering out their ſins, and beſeeching abſolution from the men whom, in a year afterwards, they degraded, inſulted, mutilated, and murdered. After changing the catholic worſhip, at the command of one gang of tyrants, for a worſhip that was neither catholic nor proteſtant,—at the command of another, they abandoned all worſhip whatſoever, and publicly

rejoiced that " the ſoul of man was like that of " the beaſt." A third gang orders them to believe that there is a God: inſtantly the ſubmiſſive brutes acknowledge his exiſtence, and fall on their knees at the ſight of Robeſpierre, proclaiming the decree with as much devotion as they formerly did at the elevation of the ſacred hoſt.

Politically conſidered, they are equally *enlightened*. Every ſucceſſive faction has been the object of their huzzas in the day of its power, and of their execrations in that of its fall. They crowded to the bar of the Convention to felicitate Robeſpierre on his eſcape from the poignard of a woman; and, in leſs than ſix weeks afterwards, danced round his ſcaffold, and mocked his dying groans.—Firſt they approve of a conſtitution with a hereditary monarch, whoſe perſon they declare *inviolable* and *ſacred*, and ſwear to defend him with their lives. Next they murder this monarch, and declare themſelves a republic, to be governed by a ſingle chamber of delegates. This ſecond conſtitution they deſtroy, and frame a third, with two chambers and five co-equal kings.—After having ſpent five years in making war, in the name of Liberty and Equality, upon arms, ſtars, garters, croſſes, and every other exterior ſign of ſuperiority of rank, they very peaceably and tamely ſuffer their maſters to dub themſelves with what titles they pleaſe, and excluſively to aſſume garbs and badges of diſtinction far more numerous than thoſe which formerly exiſted in France.

But, the circumſtance beſt calculated to give a juſt idea of their baſeneſs of ſpirit and ſwiniſh ignorance, is, their ſanctioning a conſtitution

which declares that they ſhall elect the members of their aſſemblies, and then ſubmitting to a decree, obliging them to chooſe two-thirds of the number out of the Convention. Nor was this all; the Convention, not content with enſuring the re-election of theſe two-thirds, reſerved to itſelf the power of rejecting ſuch members of the other third as it might not approve of!—And yet the wiſe Mr. Parker calls the French "a *free* and "*enlightened* people," and very piouſly wiſhes that *Kingcraft* may be done away, and that *republicaniſm* may *enlighten* the whole earth!—The Houſe of Repreſentatives were afraid even to hint that this nation of poor, cajoled, cozened, bullied, bamboozled devils were leſs enlightened than the people of America!

There is not a true American (and I love to believe that a very great majority of the people of theſe ſtates are of that deſcription) who does not reject with ſcorn the idea of being upon a level with the regenerated French; not only in underſtanding, but in any reſpect whatever. Their very friends, the Democrats, nay their beſt paid hirelings, deſpiſe them in their hearts, as much as a proſtitute deſpiſes her cully.

After having contemplated the modeſt and humble tone of the anti-federal members towards France, it may not be amiſs to contraſt it with their language towards Great Britain, on an occaſion ſomewhat ſimilar.—It was reported, that his Britannic Majeſty had iſſued inſtructions for ſeizing American veſſels, contrary to the law of nations. It was, indeed, well known that many veſſels were ſeized; but it was not known that the ſeizure was authoriſed by theſe inſtructions. They

were equivocal, and therefore left room to hope that they were miſconſtrued by intereſted individuals, and that an indemnification would be obtained by a manly and temperate repreſentation of the injury. This hope, which was then entertained by the friends of the federal government, has ſince been completely realized. But what was the tone of Mr. Madiſon, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Dayton, and all thoſe who are now for ſoftening their language towards France, till it ſurpaſſes in effeminacy the pipe of a ſickly girl? What were the meaſures they then propoſed? *Lay a double duty on their goods*, ſaid one; *Prohibit all trade with them*, ſaid another; and Mr. Dayton offered a reſolution for "ſequeſtrating all debts due from "the citizens of the United States to the ſubjects "of the king of Great Britain."—Thus, without waiting a moment to inquire whether the king's inſtructions were miſinterpreted, or whether an indemnification was likely to be obtained, the ſeizure was to be regarded as a commencement of hoſtilities; repriſals were immediately to be made, and that, too, in a mode that every honourable and honeſt man turns from with ſcorn. —— Was this very "*palatable*," Mr. Dayton?

It was during this memorable debate, that Mr. Smith, from Maryland, *modeſtly* exclaimed, "Let us adopt the reſolution. It will arreſt "*twenty millions* of dollars in our hands, as a fund "to reimburſe the *three* or *four* millions which "we have been ſtripped of by that *piratical* "*nation*, Great Britain, according to the inſtruc-"tions of that *king of ſea-robbers*; that *leviathan* "who aims at ſwallowing up all that ſwims on "the ocean; that *monſter* whoſe only law is power, "and who reſpects neither the rights of nations

" nor the property of individuals."—Was this *decent* and *honeſt* ſpeech very "*palatable?*"—Theſe political cooks ſeem to be very ſkilful in diſtinguiſhing the difference between the palates of Britons and that of the ſoupe-maigre, frog-eating French, who reliſh nothing that is not *bien cuit*, or coddled to mummy, except the fleſh and blood of Ariſtocrats.

Striking as this contraſt is, it is not ſeen in its proper light till accompanied with a comparative view of the injuries received from the two nations. The Britiſh, when they were called *pirates*, *ſea-robbers*, and *monſters*, by a member of Congreſs, had unlawfully ſeized on American property, to the amount of " *three* or *four* mil-" lions of dollars." The French, even at that time, were guilty of the ſame aggreſſions; and of this the Congreſs could not plead ignorance, as it was ſtated to them, by order of the Preſident, in the ſame report that complains of the conduct of the Britiſh. At the preſent epoch, it is acknowledged that the depredations of the French are double in amount to thoſe of the Britiſh, before any indemnification was obtained. But, to avoid all diſpute on this ſubject, let us ſuppoſe that the loſs from both nations to be of exactly the ſame amount, and confine our remarks to the vaſt difference in their anterior ſituation and ſubſequent conduct with reſpect to this country. Great Britain had no treaty, either of amity or commerce, with America; her conduct towards us, therefore, was ſubject to no rule but that preſcribed by the general law of nations, the principles of which, often leaving room for miſinterpretation, give a ſcope to an abuſe of power that does not, if reparation be demanded and

obtained, fix the ſtigma of cowardice or dependence on the injured nation. The ſituation of the French was quite different. The depredations committed by them are in direct violation of a ſolemn contract, voluntarily entered into with America. Great Britain excuſed herſelf by declaring (whether truly or not is no matter) that her orders had been miſconſtrued, that ſhe was ready to make reſtitution: and it is well known that ſhe has made good this declaration, by paying the full value of the cargoes and veſſels illegally ſeized. But the conduct of the French leaves no room for an excuſe. They cannot plead a miſconſtruction of their orders; their ſpoliations have not taken place under an ambiguous inſtruction, but are warranted by a decree of their tyrannical aſſembly; and, to deprive America of the hope of indemnification, and even of the appearance of maintaining her rights, they have hurled this decree in our teeth. The Britiſh unlawfully ſeized on the property of Americans, or, if you will, in the polite language of Maryland Mr. Smith, that nation of "monſters" robbed them; but the miniſter of theſe "monſters" did not proclaim the plundering order in this country, and inſult the people whom they had robbed, by telling them that it was the fault of their own Executive. The French have done all this, and ten times more: they have trampled upon the independence of Americans, braved them, ſcoffed at them; they have done every thing but kick the Preſident from his chair and take poſſeſſion of the government: and yet Mr. Dayton, the *energetic* Mr. Dayton, ſays not a word about *ſequeſtration*; he is even afraid to compliment his conſtituents on their *freedom* and *underſtanding*, leſt it ſhould be *unpalatable* to this inſidious, treacherous, and inſolent nation. Not a word do

we now hear about "*pirates* and *ſea-robbers*, and "*leviathans* and *monſters*:" all breathe a deſire to cultivate "*harmony*, *perfect friendſhip*, and *affec-* "*tion*." In ſpeaking of the depredations of the Britiſh, "nothing," it was ſaid, "was to be ex- "pected from the *juſtice* of a nation who had "robbed us;" but now, behold, every thing is to "be left to the "*juſtice* and *moderation*" of the French, after we are not only well aſſured that their robberies have ſo far ſurpaſſed thoſe of the Britiſh, but after their miniſter has contemptuouſly told us that thoſe robberies are ſanctioned by his government; that it has given orders for violating the treaty, and is determined to continue in the violation. Thus, one nation is ſpoken of with approbation, eſteem, and affection; is even flattered and careſſed, after loading us with injuries a thouſand times greater than thoſe which drew down on another nation the indecent and opprobrious terms of "*pirates* and *monſters*." Is this a proof of the candour or of the obſtinate prejudice, of the wiſdom or folly, of the Houſe of Repreſentatives? Is it a proof of the independence of America on Great Britain, or of its abject dependence on France?

To what are we to aſcribe the immeaſurable difference between the daring and inſulting tone formerly aſſumed towards Britain, and the poor, piping, puſillanimous language that is now held towards France? Is it becauſe one is a monarchy, and the other calls itſelf a republic? I have heard, or read, of a fellow that was ſo accuſtomed to be kicked, that he could diſtinguiſh, by the feel, the ſort of leather that aſſailed his poſteriors. Are our buttocks arrived at this perfection of ſenſibility? And do we really find that a republican

ſhoe wounds our honour leſs than a monarchical one? Is an injury from a nation on whom we heaped every term of abuſe, and for whoſe annihilation we, and even ſome of our parſons, devoutly prayed, leſs calculated to rouſe our feelings than the accumulated injuries and inſults of another nation, whom we diſtinguiſhed by every ſign of partiality—for whoſe misfortunes we put on mourning, and for whoſe victories we mocked and inſulted Heaven with thankſgiving? Is a ſingle ſlap on the cheek from a power with whom we had no connexion, leſs offenſive than reiterated blows from an *ally?* Finally, Is the commerce of Britain leſs neceſſary to America than that of France, or is the power of the latter more to be dreaded than that of the former?—This laſt queſtion is the only one that requires to be examined: the reſt, I truſt, are already anſwered in the mind of the reader.

The neceſſity of a commercial connexion between Great Britain and America, is ſo loudly and unequivocally aſſerted by the unerring voice of experience, that nothing but the blindeſt ignorance, or the moſt unconquerable prejudice, could poſſibly have called it in queſtion. Immediately after the ſuſpenſion of this commerce, cauſed by the revolutionary war, it was on both ſides reſumed with more ardour than ever, notwithſtanding all the arts that France and her partizans employed to prevent it. In vain did poor Louis iſſue edicts to encourage his people to ſupplant their rivals; in vain did he take off his duties and offer premiums; in vain did friend Briſſot coax the Quakers, and citizen Madiſon ſpeechify the Congreſs: in ſpite of all their fine promiſes, cajoling, and wheedling; in ſpite of the mortifica-

tion of Britain, and the more powerful prejudice of America, no ſooner was the obſtacle removed by the return of peace, than, without a treaty of friendſhip or commerce, without any other ſtimulus than mutual intereſt, confidence, and inclination, the two countries ruſhed together like congenial waters that had been ſeparated by an artificial dyke.

It is this natural connexion with Britain, the Britiſh capital, which a confidence in the ſtability of the government invites hither, together with the credit that the merchants of that country give to thoſe of this: a credit which Britiſh merchants alone are either willing or able to give, that forms the great ſource of American wealth. Mr. Smith from Maryland, the *polite* Mr. Smith, who called the Britiſh "*ſea-robbers* and *monſters*," incautiouſly acknowledged, in the ſame breath, that theſe "monſters" gave a ſtationary credit to this country, amounting to *twenty millions of dollars*. Grateful gentleman!—A very great part of this credit is given for a twelvemonth at leaſt; ſo that the ſimple intereſt on it amounts to *one million two hundred thouſand dollars annually*: an advantage to this country that might have merited in return ſomething "*more palatable*" than "*ſea-robbers* "and *monſters*."

If America could obtain what ſhe ſtands in need of (which ſhe cannot) from any other country than Britain, from what country on earth could ſhe obtain them on terms like theſe? The capacity of France, in the brighteſt days of her commercial proſperity, was fairly tried. Correſpondencies were opened with her merchants; but what was the reſult? The total ruin of them and of all thoſe

who were concerned with them. They are no more; they are forgotten. Their trade could be equalled in ſhortneſs of duration by nothing but the wear of their merchandiſe.

To ſay, as ſome of the French faction have done, that America does not want the manufactures of Britain, is an inſult on the national diſcernment, little ſhort of the *blunderbuſs* of my old friend Citizen Adet. Let any man take a view of his dreſs (when he is dreſſed like a man) from head to foot; from the garments that he wears to ſea, to plough, to market, or to church, down to thoſe with which he ſteps into bed; let him look round his ſhop, and round the ſhops of his neighbours; let him examine his library, his bed-chamber, his parlour, and his kitchen, and then let him ſay how great a part of all he ſees, of all that is indiſpenſable, uſeful, or convenient; let him ſay how great a part of all this comes from Great Britain, and how ſmall a one from France, or any other country; and then, if he be fool enough, let him ſay with the Gallican faction, that we ſtand in no need of the manufactures of Britain.

The commercial connexion between this country and Great Britain is full as neceſſary as that between the baker and miller; while the connexion between America and France may be compared to one between the baker and the milliner, or toyman. France may furniſh us with looking-glaſſes; but without the aid of Britain, we ſhall be aſhamed to ſee ourſelves in them, unleſs the Sans Culottes can perſuade us that thread-bare beggary is a beauty. France may deck the heads of our wives and daughters (but by the bye, ſhe ſhan't thoſe of mine) with ribbons, gauze, and powder;

their ears with bobs, their cheeks with paint, and their heels with gaudy party-coloured ſilk, as rotten as the hearts of the manufacturers; but Great Britain muſt cover their and our bodies. When the rain pours down and waſhes the roſe from the cheek; when the bleak north-weſter blows through the gauze, then it is that we know our friends. Great Britain muſt wrap us up warm, and keep us all decent, ſnug, and comfortable, from the child in ſwaddling-cloths to its tottering grandſire. France may ſend us cockades, as ſhe does (or has done) in abundance; but Great Britain muſt ſend us hats to ſtick them on. France may furniſh the ruffle, but Great Britain muſt ſend us the ſhirt; and the commerce of the latter nation is juſt as much more neceſſary to this country than that of the former, as a good decent ſhirt is more neceſſary than a paltry diſh-clout of a ruffle.

As, then, the importance of a trade with any nation muſt be the ſtandard whereby to meaſure the embarraſſment and diſtreſs that its ſuſpenſion would produce, it is evident that a war with Great Britain would, in this reſpect, have been productive of infinite calamities to America, while a war with France would hardly be felt. The dangers, therefore, to be apprehended from military operations only, remain to be conſidered.

By going back to the epoch when the hoſtile tone was aſſumed towards Great Britain, I could repreſent her as in poſſeſſion of the *Weſtern Poſts*, and conſequently as in a ſituation to arm and ſupport the Indians, to harraſs that frontier, and by thoſe means find employment for an army of the United States, and that a very expenſive one too. But I ſhall decline this advantage, and conſider

things in their preſent ſtate: I ſhall even ſuppoſe all inroads from Canada impoſſible, I ſhall turn my eyes to the ſea only, and there take a view of what might be reaſonably feared from a war with Great Britain, and what from a war with France.

The mighty difference in the maritime power, ſkill, and courage of the two nations, is ſo univerſally known, and has undergone ſo many and ſo convincing proofs during the preſent war, that any compariſon in this reſpect would be ſuperfluous. The hirelings of France do, however, pretend that ſhe could eat us up alive, crack us as a ſquirrel does a nut, while we could boldly bid defiance to her rival. I ſhall not ſuppoſe it poſſible for Great Britain to bombard our towns and burn our ſhipping; I ſhall look upon all our harbours as completely defended: I ſhall even ſuppoſe it impoſſible for her to make a landing on any part of our coaſt; to carry off a ſingle ſack of flour or head of cattle; and only inſiſt that, with thirty detached frigates and a ſquadron of twenty ſhips of the line, ſhe could completely block up every principal port in the United States, in defiance of the French and their new allies, Holland and Spain. If I am told to look back to what ſhe was able to do in this way laſt war,—I reply, That the commerce, the foreign relationſhips, of this country, are not now what they were then; nor would the ſpecies of war carried on by Britain be the ſame. Then ſhe had armies on the land, on which the operations of her fleet were dependent: it had garriſons to ſupply, convoys to eſcort, and tranſports to conduct from one ſtate to another. Thoſe who look to France and her allies for relief, forget that, during this war, France has loſt *thirty-nine ſhips of the line*, with a proportionate number

of frigates; that the remnant of her ſhattered fleet is now blocked up in her own ports, and that her petty armaments ſkulk about from harbour to harbour, as if their only object was to keep out of ſight. They forget that the Dutch dare not peep out of the Texel; and that the Spaniards, after muſtering their all together, are ſtationed before a place of refuge in the Mediterranean. In this ſituation of things, nothing could prevent Great Britain from totally cutting off the commerce of America, exports as well as imports, trebling the price of every article of foreign manufacture, and rendering the produce of the land a drug; deſtroying the revenue of the country at the very moment that a tenfold augmentation of it would be neceſſary.

From the French and their allies, on the contrary, America has little, nay, nothing to fear. When we are told about their demoliſhing our towns and invading our country, it ſeems to be forgotten that they muſt croſs the ſea to come to us. Fear ſeems to have deranged the trembling wretches who hold this language. They talk and think about the proweſs of the barbarian armies, till they imagine us divided from them by a river only, or that it is as eaſy for an hundred thouſand of them to be ſhipped off and landed in America, as for them to croſs the Rhine: they imagine that a fleet of three hundred tranſports and fifty ſhips of the line, as eaſily erected as a bridge of boats: and, during this terrific reverie, it never once ſtrikes them that Great Britain is at war with the French, or that her fleets would blow them to atoms before they could approach our coaſt. Mr. Giles, and all thoſe who talk about the danger of incurring the diſpleaſure of the French, delight in

repreſenting her as ready to make an attack on us, in conjunction with the Spaniards. This is true; and we are informed that they have already ſet their "natural allies" to ſeize and confiſcate our veſſels *. There is no doubt but both nations would willingly co-operate in ſuch an enterprize; but I would aſk Mr. Giles ſeriouſly, Whether he thinks America would ſtand ſingly in the war? Whether he thinks the government or the people ſo incorrigibly blind and ſtupid, as, while they ſee the French calling in all hell to their aid, to refuſe the only aſſiſtance capable of repulſing the infernal hoſt. — Oh, Lord, ſays Mr. Giles, what are you talking about? "I diſlike extremely any *in-* "*timate connexion* betwixt this country and Bri- "tain, notwithſtanding pecuniary advantages may "ariſe from it." So ſays Citizen Adet, and ſo ſays every Frenchman as well as Mr. Giles. Yes; this is what they "diſlike;" this is the thing, and the only thing, they are afraid of; and it is for that very reaſon that it ought to take place.

But I ſhould be glad to know on what Mr. Giles founds his "diſlike to this connexion, in caſe of a war. He acknowledges its "pecuniary advantages;" and that is one great point gained; for you well know, Mr. Giles, that in *connexions*

* It is pretended by France, that our treaty with Britain contravenes that with her; and for that reaſon ſhe ſeizes our veſſels. Groundleſs and inſolent as this pretext is, it is worth noticing now that the Spaniards have begun to imitate her. We had no treaty with them when that with Great Britain was formed, and therefore, I preſume, that the "magnanimous Spaniſh monarch," as Mr. Swanwick called him, will allege that our treaty with him was contravened *before it was made*; nor ſhould I much wonder if members in Congreſs were to be found, courageous and patriotic enough to attempt to ſupport the charge.—This is all that is wanted to fill up the meaſure of our humiliation.

with foreign nations, nothing goes on cheerly *without money*. What, then, can be the objection? Becauſe America is a *Republic* and Britain a *Monarchy?* This was the old objection to the treaty of amity and commerce with Great Britain; but it very luckily happened that, juſt before that treaty was concluded, the Republic of France had made a ſimilar treaty with the King of Pruſſia; and now, as if on purpoſe to give us a ſecond example, ſhe has concluded a treaty offenſive and defenſive with the King of Spain; and has called that nation her "*natural* ally."

Now, Mr. Giles, rub that forehead of yours a little, and tell me ſincerely, without any quibbling or ſubterfuge, Whether you think the Spaniards are more *naturally allied* to the French than the Americans are to the Britiſh?

Surely, no nation was ever ſo completely duped as America has been by the French and their partizans! By a ſincere and hearty alliance with Great Britain, ſhe would not only place herſelf in a ſituation to make a peremptory demand of indemnification from France, but, in caſe of refuſal, would be able to ſtrip both France and Spain of every inch of territory they poſſeſs in this hemiſphere. There is no danger of any other nation taking umbrage at this. America and Great Britain might bid defiance to the world. The map of this continent and its iſlands lies open before them: they might cut and carve for themſelves, and ſit down in the quiet enjoyment of their conqueſts. The very mention of ſuch an alliance would ſcare the Dons at the bottom of their mines, and would make the *ſeven hundred and five tyrants* tremble on their thrones. Yet the hirelings of

France tell us that this alliance muſt not be formed, becauſe, forſooth, Britain is a monarchy! Poor, paltry objection! France avails herſelf of all the raſcally aid ſhe can rake together: ſhe forms treaties with all the monarchies ſhe can find baſe enough to join her, and calls them her *natural allies*; but if America makes a treaty with a monarchy, be it merely for the purpoſes of adjuſting diſputes and regulating trade, France, "terrible France," takes offence at it, calls it an unnatural connexion, ſeizes our veſſels as a puniſhment for it, and (with ſhame be it ſpoken!) is juſtified by ſome of thoſe who are choſen to preſerve the honour and independence of the country!

All the world are the *natural allies* of France; republics, ariſtocracies, monarchies, and deſpotiſms; Dutch, Genoeſe, Spaniards, Turks, and Devils; but poor America has no *natural ally* at all, except France herſelf; and, if ſhe chooſes, with the aid of her allies, to rob and inſult her, America muſt accept of no one's aſſiſtance, but muſt ſtand and be pillaged and kicked till the by-ſtanders cry ſhame!—Honourable Independence! "Glorious Revolution!" If this muſt be the caſe, let us hear no more boaſtings and rejoicings: let *the fourth of July* be changed from a feſtival to a faſt, or rather let it be effaced for ever from the Calendar.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE END.